



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/711,323	11/09/2000	Alfonso de Jesus Valdes	10454-014002	6879

52197 7590 08/11/2008

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
SRI INTERNATIONAL
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE
SUITE 100
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER

MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/711,323	Applicant(s) VALDES ET AL.	
	Examiner Aravind K. Moorthy	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>see attachment</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on 12 May 2008.
2. Claims 1-5 and 10-12 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-5 and 10-12 have been rejected.
4. Claims 6-9 and 13 have been cancelled.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The examiner has considered the information disclosure statements (IDS) filed on 22 February 2008.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12 May 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 6, the applicant argues that the amendment to claims 10, 12 and 13 overcomes the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 101. The applicant argues that Purtell fails to disclose or suggest a method for correlating sensors in an intrusion detection system by adjusting a belief state of a first sensor based on a belief state of a second sensor, where the adjustment improves the sensitivity of the first sensor to suspicious activity (e.g., attempted communications with a nonexistent services or resources) and/or reduces alarms generated by erroneous transactions, as claimed in applicants' independent claims 1, 4, 5 and 10-12.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The amendment made to claims 10, 12 and 13 do not over come the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 101. After a careful review of the specification, the examiner asserts that the applicant has not shown that the computer readable medium is hardware. The examiner has found no support of a "computer readable storage

Art Unit: 2131

medium”. As to the argument that Purtell does not disclose an intrusion detection system, the examiner asserts that Purtell discloses firewalls. The examiner asserts that it is well known in the art that a firewall is designed to prevent unauthorized access to and from a private network. Firewalls are frequently used to prevent unauthorized Internet users from accessing private networks connected to the Internet. Purtell discloses that the CCB update packet 400 is the data structure through which a firewall 100 shares its CCBs 300 with the other firewalls 100 on the internal network 102. The CCB update packet 400 includes one or more CCBs 300. The one or more CCBs 300 in the CCB update packet 400 are copies of the one or more CCBs 300 located in the computer which originated the CCB update packet 400. The CCB update packet 400 includes a packet header 402 identifying the CCB update packet 400 and providing other information useful for properly routing the CCB update packet 400 to the appropriate firewall or firewalls 100. The use of a packet header to transmit a data packet is known in the art. Purtell discloses that the CCBs enable the firewalls to adapt to changing network conditions. The examiner asserts that the ability to adapt to changing network conditions will enable improvement to the sensitivity of the firewalls.

On page 7, the applicant argues that Purtell says nothing about the need to monitor the network for suspected intrusions.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. See the above discussion regarding firewalls.

On page 10, the applicant argues that Purtell fails to teach or suggest that the first and second sensors are different types of sensors.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The sensors of Purtell can be a firewall or a proxy server.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 10, 12 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 10 is directed towards a computer readable storage medium containing an executable program for correlating a first sensor to a second sensor in an intrusion detection system. Independent claim 12 is directed towards a computer readable medium containing an executable program for reducing false alarms generated by an intrusion detection system when a monitored resource is degraded or compromised. Independent claim 13 is directed towards a computer readable medium containing an executable program for enhancing the sensitivity of an intrusion detection system that monitors a plurality of computer system resources. When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored in a computer-readable medium, in a computer, on an electromagnetic carrier signal does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer."). Such a result would exalt form over substance. In *re Sarkar*, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978) ("[E]ach

Art Unit: 2131

invention must be evaluated as claimed; yet semantogenic considerations preclude a determination based solely on words appearing in the claims. In the final analysis under Sec. 101, the claimed invention, as a whole, must be evaluated for what it is.") (quoted with approval in *Abele*, 684 F.2d at 907, 214 USPQ at 687). See also *In re Johnson*, 589 F.2d 1070, 1077, 200 USPQ 199, 206 (CCPA 1978) ("form of the claim is often an exercise in drafting").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1.

As to claim 1, Purtell et al discloses a method for correlating a first sensor to a second sensor in an intrusion detection system, the first sensor and the second sensor each maintaining belief regarding a resource or service monitored by of the intrusion detection system, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) transmitting to the first sensor information about a belief state of the second sensor, the belief state of the second sensor indicating a state of at least one system resource or service directly monitored by the second sensor [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17]; and

(b) adjusting a prior belief state of the first sensor, the belief state of the first sensor indicating a state of at least one system resource or service directly monitored by the first sensor, the adjusting is based at least in part on the belief state of the second sensor, so that a sensitivity of the first sensor to suspicious activity in the intrusion detection system is improved [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17].

As to claim 2, Purtell et al discloses that the first sensor and the second sensor are different types of sensors [column 2, lines 48-55].

As to claim 4, Purtell et al discloses a method of reducing false alarms generated by an intrusion detection system when a monitored resource is degraded or compromised, the intrusion detection system having a first sensor and a second sensor each maintaining belief regarding a state of a resource monitored by the intrusion detection system, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) transmitting to the first sensor all or part of a belief of the second sensor regarding an apparent normal, degraded or compromised state of a resource directly monitored by the second sensor [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17]; and

(b) adjusting a belief state of the first sensor, the belief state of the first sensor indicating an apparent normal, degraded or compromised state of a resource directly monitored by the first, so that an erroneous transaction with the degraded or compromised resource does not generate an alarm in the intrusion detection system [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17].

As to claim 5, Purtell et al discloses a method of enhancing a sensitivity of an intrusion detection system that monitors a plurality of computer system resources, the intrusion detection system having a first sensor and a second sensor each maintaining belief regarding a service monitored by the intrusion detection system, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) transmitting to the first sensor all or part of a belief state of the second sensor regarding an existence or validity of services supported on computer system resources directly monitored by the second sensor [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17]; and

(b) adjusting a belief state of the first sensor, the belief state of the first sensor indicating an existence or validity of services supported on computer system resources directly monitored by the first sensor so that an attempted communication with a nonexistent system service or resource appears suspicious to the intrusion detection system [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17].

As to claim 10, Purtell et al discloses a computer readable storage medium containing an executable program for correlating a first sensor to a second sensor in an intrusion detection system, the first sensor and the second sensor each maintaining belief regarding a resource or service monitored by the intrusion detection system, where the program performs the steps of:

(a) transmitting to the first sensor information about a belief state of the second sensor, the belief state of the second sensor indicating a state of at least one system resource or service directly monitored by the second sensor [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17]; and

(b) adjusting a belief state of the first sensor, the belief state of the first sensor indicating a state of at least one system resource or service directly monitored by the first sensor, the adjusting based at least in part on the belief state of the second sensor, so that a sensitivity of the first sensor to suspicious activity in the intrusion detection system is improved [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17].

As to claim 11, Purtell et al discloses a computer readable storage medium containing an executable program for reducing false alarms generated by an intrusion detection system when a monitored resource is degraded or compromised, the intrusion detection system having a first sensor and a second sensor each maintaining belief regarding a state of a resource monitored by of the intrusion detection system, where the program performs the steps of:

(a) transmitting to the first sensor all or part of a belief of the second sensor regarding an apparent normal, degraded or compromised state of a resource directly monitored by the second sensor [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17]; and

(b) adjusting a belief state of the first sensor, the belief state of the first sensor indicating an apparent normal, degraded or compromised state of a resource directly monitored by the first sensor so that an erroneous transaction with the degraded or compromised resource does not generate an alarm in the intrusion detection system [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17].

As to claim 12, Purtell et al discloses a computer readable storage medium containing an executable program for enhancing a sensitivity of an intrusion detection system that monitors a plurality of computer system resources, the intrusion detection system having a first sensor and a second sensor each maintaining belief regarding a service monitored by the intrusion detection system, where the program performs the steps of:

(a) transmitting to the first sensor all or part of a belief state of the second sensor regarding an existence or validity of services supported on computer system resources directly monitored by the second sensor [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17]; and

(b) adjusting a belief state of the first sensor, the belief state of the first sensor indicating an existence or validity of services supported on computer system resources directly monitored by the first sensor so that an attempted communication with a nonexistent service or resource appears suspicious to the intrusion detection system [column 5 line 29 to column 7 line 17].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtell et al U.S. Patent No. 6,950,947 B1 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Timm U.S. Patent No. 5,440,498.

As to claim 3, Purtell et al does not teach that the first sensor is a probabilistic sensor.

Timm teaches a probabilistic sensor in intrusion detection systems [column 5, lines 7-46].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al so that the first sensor would have been a probabilistic sensor.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Purtell et al by the teaching of Timm because it provides that ability to compare the effectiveness of any security element or group of elements of the security system with another element or group of elements. Not only does this method reveal the less effective security elements of a system, but also it can be employed to evaluate whether proposed additions to a security system would enhance protection of the facility and, if so, by how much [column 2, lines 16-29].

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aravind K Moorthy/
Examiner, Art Unit 2131
/Ayaz R. Sheikh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131